

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 12 are amended. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Hayes for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative, Mr. Jason Vick, during the recent telephone interviews. Based on these conversations, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 12.

The Office Action objects to the specification for a number of informalities. Again, regarding the Appendices, Applicants are currently reviewing the best approach to have this subject matter included in the specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this objection be held in abeyance until the indication of allowable subject matter.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 7-17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,958,016 to Chang et al. (hereinafter "Chang") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,825,769 to O'Reilly (hereinafter "O'Reilly"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, ... a requestor application enabling the customer to communicate a data report request message via said integrated interface to the report manager server, the request message being verified to ensure valid formatting and appropriate parameters for the customer specific data,... said customer-specific retrieved data and said metadata description of said reporting items are communicated to said client workstation and utilized to generate a completed report for presentation to said customer, the completed report capable of being dynamically determined based on the metadata and one or more of customization options and user options.

Similarly, claim 12 recites, *inter alia*, ... generating a corresponding response message including a metadata description of said reporting items for a requested report; verifying the request message to ensure valid formatting and appropriate parameters for the reporting items,... generating a completed report for said customer from said metadata description of said reporting items and said retrieved said customer-specific data via said

integrated interface, the completed report capable of being dynamically determined based on the metadata and one or more of customization options and user options.

Support for these amendments can at least be found on pages 90-91 of the specification.

The Office submits that Chang teaches that a user can enter a request by clicking on text or icons or sending typed inputs to a server and that this meets the language of the claims since the text, icons or typed inputs would be data that describes a type of data desired by the user. However, while selecting icons may identify data to be retrieved that is associated with that icon, Applicants still respectfully submit that this can not be equated to the metadata as currently recited in claims 1 and 12 where the completed report is capable of being dynamically determined based on this metadata. Neither Chang nor O'Reilly teach, suggests or disclose any hardware and/or functionality that is capable of performing this function.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit neither reference teaches, suggests or discloses any means, methodology or functionality capable of "the request message being verified to ensure valid formatting and appropriate parameters for the customer specific data" as recited in claim 1 and "verifying the request message to ensure valid formatting and appropriate parameters for the reporting items" as recited in claim 12.,

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit the cited references either alone or in combination fail to teach, suggest or disclose each and every aspect of claims 1 and 12. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that the remainder of the claims which depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 and 12 are also not obvious in view of the cited references for at least the reasons outlined above and the additional feature(s) they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4, 7-17 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 5-6 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Chang and O'Reilly and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,240,450 to Sharples et al (hereinafter "Sharples"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants respectfully submit that Sharples at least fails to overcome the deficiencies noted above in relation to Chang and O'Reilly. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit

that the cited references either alone or in combination, fail to teach, suggest or disclose each and every aspect of the claims. Accordingly, the cited references fail to render obvious claims 5-6 and 18. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5-6 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Applicants respectfully submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Jason H. Vick
Registration No. 45,285

JHV:adc

NIXON PEABODY LLP
401 9th Street, NW, Suite 900
Washington, DC 20004-2128
Telephone: (202) 585-8000
Facsimile: (202) 585-8080